

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Tuesday, December 19, 2017
Conference Room B, Beacon Building (First Floor)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

I. Attendance

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Michael Brown; Tedd Hardesty; Kyle Katz; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace

Absent: Otto Beatty, Jr.; Robert Loversidge; Danni Palmore

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Dan Blechschmidt

II. Approval of the November 21, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve MB, TH (6-0)

13:50

III. Additional Information Requested for Prior Approved Case

Case #1 17-9-3

14:08

Address: 220 E. Main Street

Applicant: Nicholas Kinney

Design Professional: SEM Architects

Attorney: David Dachner

Property Owner: Lev Kucherski

Request:

At their September 26, 2017 meeting the Downtown Commission approved the issuance Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation of the second and third floors of two existing older commercial buildings into apartments.

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) to allow initial building review to occur. A CoA has yet to be issued. The subject of this meeting is to review the request for more information.

Discussion NK – here to talk about materials and details of the balconies as well as lighting. Elevations and details (sections) shown. The balconies will be either galvanized steel or black. The vertical struts will be on the inside. Lighting details shown. MB – you’ve done everything that we asked for, motion to accept again, KK – 2nd. NK – regular street lighting will reinforce the lighting on the building. The horizontal members are steel bar. The windows will be replaced.

Results: Details approved (6-0)

IV. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

Case #2 17-12-1

21:30

Address: 65 S. Washington Ave.

Block bound by E. Oak, S. Washington, Library Park Dr. - North and S. 9th St.

Applicant and Design Professionals: Jay Boone / Moody Nolan

EDGE Group – Landscape Architecture / Tim Skinner

Property Owner: Mike Lisi / Motorist Insurance Group

Attorney Michael B. Coleman / Ice Miller

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for mixed use project, primarily residential . CC3359.05(C)1)

The project was presented to the Commission on a conceptual basis at their June 2017 meeting. In October 2017 the Commission was given an update, particularly about the status of the Library Park Drive conversion to a promenade.

Discussion will also focus on off-site temporary buffers for existing Motorist surface parking.

Discussion MN – 91 units and 155 covered parking spaces. Traditional architecture. EG – review of site. Responded to concerns of pedestrian tightness of Oak Street. Tried to maximize pedestrian area (10 ft.) by use of tree grates. Do not need the full 20 ft. along Library Park – portions used for landscaping. Creation of nice pedestrian promenade, including stairs going down to lower units. SW – had questions related to clarifying dimensions. EG – almost 2.5ft of original R.O.W. is in the park. That will remain in the park. A new entrance into the park is proposed. SW – question about the “step-up” on the north side – EG – there will be a 4 inch curb there. SW – some concerns that there could be flooding issues in the event of a major storm. EG - slope is away from building to center of promenade. MN – there are also drains in the lower courtyards. The lower units are flats with two story townhouse units above. JM – what do you see at the terminus of the promenade heading in either direction? EG – decorative bollards will terminate the promenade and will be screening the parking lots to the east on a temporary basis.

JM – concern also with screening for the garage along Oak Street. Pedestrian traffic along there should increase as development occurs. Think about this as an aesthetic experience and make more interesting. MK, KK – also offered suggestions – changes in material, relief, planters. SW – planting plan is simple. EG – that is still being developed. SW – this projects wants to be well planted. Don’t try to save money on this facet. East and west side will have raised planters.

Material samples brought. Lighting plan shown. Elevations shown. Perforated metal on the garage (Oak St.) side. KK – looks perfectly utilitarian. You are challenged by two primary facades. Oak St. is not a pleasant pedestrian experience. JM – could there be alternatives – use of glass half way up or some other device? How area for air circulation is needed? MN – natural light into the garage is a factor. JM – transparency and keeping a more residential look. KK – achieve articulation in the wall that follows the rhythm of the building. A monotonous piece that you could do more with. ML – and also with the balcony (in terms of materials and varied height). You could alternate between railing and solid. MN – different colors have been looked at. Residents will also help activate the balcony spaces. MB – this is a beautiful project but this one wall seems like an outlier.

Sample of window, which will be black, brought. Muntins will be seen on the outside. The different bricks, somewhat similar but enough to offset. There will be a lot of relief. Windows will have stone lintels or brick arches. SW, KK – emphasis on details. SW – any alteration of mortar colors? A –

No. Slate line shingles (some historical appearance). Doors – black. Dark aluminum gutters and downspouts. Brick risers on steps. Some cast stone. Perforated metal on the parking garage side.

MB – is there any way we can allow this project to go forward while making improvements to the garage for future deliberation? I would love to see a night rendering, especially on the Oak St. side. SW – I think you could have an easy fix to this. KK – move for acceptance but for north façade wall. Come back with some alternatives for that. MB – 2nd. MN – will be coming back for permit at the end of February.

Results: Motion to approve . Acceptance but for north façade wall which will come back with some alternatives (5-1-0) (Hardesty recusing).

Case #3 17-12-2

51:00

Address: 101 E. Main St. (Southeast corner of Main and Third Streets)

Applicant: John Hanks

Property Owner: Zettler Company Realty

Architect: Berardi + Partners, Inc. / Jonathan Leonard

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation of mixed use project, ground floor retail, upper floors - office. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion DJT – the former Zettler Hardware was built in 1891. JL – site context. Floor plans shown. Elevations shown. The elevator is not required to go up to the roof deck elevation. Not many changes will be made to the exterior. The light well area will be filled in and fire escapes removed since and additional egress stairwell will be added to the interior. There will be spandrel glass where the elevator shaft is on the second and third levels. Windows will be replaced. The cornice will be repainted and muted down. Window sizes, including first floor, will stay the same. ML – question about elevator shaft. A – It will not be seeable from the street. ML – move for approval. JM – submit window cut sheet administratively. The current windows were significantly damaged.

Results: Motion to approve, contingent upon receipt and distribution of window cut sheet. (6-0)

Case #4 17-12-3

1:08:00

Address 20 N. High St. (Northeast Corner of Broad and High)

Applicant: Orange Barrel Media

Attorney: Koopereman, Mentel, Ferguson, Yaross

Property Owner: Broad & High Development LLC

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for improvements to LED message center at the northeast corner of Broad and High. CC3359.05(C)1)

The Broad & High graphics program was originally approved by the Downtown Commission in Aug. 2007.

Discussion: DJT – Technology of LED are changing in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. This location has been in effect for about 10 years and is proposed to be updated. OB – Reviewed originally by the Downtown Commission in Aug. 2007. Individual modules are not working as well. In addition to upgrading technology, we are looking at better overall design. 1,726 of area will be reduced to 870sf. Portions of the displays on various levels will be removed. Radius changed on the curved elements that will improve the view angles. KK – move to accept. MB – 2nd. SW – this is a vast improvement. What is driving it? OB – we are driving it from a design standpoint. Marketing and aesthetic standpoints. Brighter, bigger isn't necessarily better. Before, there was too much to look at. KK – move for approval but not for regressing back to the larger space that was approved in the past. MB – leave that to the future Commissions to use their discretion. ML – how about the brightness? OB – new technology allows for better control by computer. Automatic brightness sensor that adjust to ambient light, plus a manual override. TH – City standards. SW – would you be able to comply? Put this into the motion.

Results: Motion to approve. The standard of .3 foot candle over the ambient light is applicable. (6-0)

V. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Mural (Temporary Graphic)

Case #5 17-12-4M

1:19:40

Columbus Blue Jackets ad mural

Address: 110 N. Third Street

Applicant and Design Professional: Orange Barrel Media, Columbus Blue Jackets

Property Owner: Exchange Urban Lofts Condominium Association

Request:

Approval of deviation of 15% rule for text and logo for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the north elevation of 110 N. North Street. Proposed mural – Columbus Blue Jackets “5TH LINE – March with Us” CC3359.05(C)1)

The location has seen two administratively approved murals (Maker's Mark and AEP) since April 2017, when the new code went into effect. This site has also been used for prior Blue Jacket ads.

Dimensions of mural: 26'W x 76'H, lit

Term of installation: Seeking approval from January 1 through March 31, 2018

Area of mural: 1,976 sf

Discussion: Does the text constitute art (design). Deviation should not establish precedence but should rather be viewed on the specific case by case merit. JM – I have a problem with this location so I have a difficult time judging this. I don't have a problem with the design per se. TH – move to approve.

Results: Motion to approve (6-0).

VI. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Scioto Peninsula Master Developer Announcement
Buckingham Companies - Indianapolis

Harrison Smith Award

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (November 15, 2017)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 10 W. Broad St. – Kitchen vent for relocated restaurant
2. 185 N. High St. – 2 signs for new restaurant
3. ***100 E. Gay St. – AEP ad mural – Orange Barrel***
4. ***110 N. Third St. – AEP ad mural – Orange Barrel***
5. ***260 S. Fourth St. – AEP ad mural – Orange Barrel***
6. ***34 N. High St. – Crew ad mural – Orange Barrel (not executed – Crew lost playoff)***
7. ***106 N. High St. – Crew ad mural – Orange Barrel (not executed – Crew lost playoff)***
8. ***60 E. Spring St. – Bud ad mural – Orange Barrel***
9. McPherson Common – Winter Park
10. ***64 E. Broad St. – PETA ad mural – Orange Barrel***
11. 201 S. Grant Ave.– 2 Franklin University replacement monument signs
12. 360 S. Third St. – United Way banner

Next regular meeting will be on January 23, 2018, the fourth Tuesday of the month (five weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404. **1:29:50**